

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/733,254	12/08/2000	Elana D. Granston	TI-29189	3119
23494 75	90 09/23/2004		EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED			VU, TUAN A	
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, 1A /3203			2124	
			DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

as a

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	∇
09/733,254	GRANSTON ET AL.	X.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tuan A Vu	2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a C E

inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed afficient which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under a compared to the first of the fi
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>16 August 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) Ithey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
10. Other:
BEST AVAILABLE COPY ANIL KHATRI

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: It is seen that as amended the claim is directed toward using software pipeline program and preprocessing loops. The arguments from applicants revolve around restraints in predicate register or Tack of register file leading to why the technique of register cooying would be better suited as opposed to the techniques of the prior art. Examiner sees none of those reasons being part of the claim so that they could justify how the invention would be a novelty over known techniques. If register copying is for a reason, such reason should be stated along with the justifications as to why using temp register transfer would be more optimizing than say, rotating registers or register extension as proffered in the rejection. As long as the claims do not incorporate what Applicant perceives as a improvement/difference with respect to the references used, the rejection will stand because, as interpreted as face value, the claims are fulfilled by the combination of the prior art used. Note that there is no correlation between the step of speculatively executing and the step of register copying as well as b/w live-out register being populated with iteration data and the urgency from limitness in predicate register file as set forward in Applicant's remarks. Absent any clear novel rationale in the claim, the invention amounts to amalgaming steps with no interrelationship therebetween, i.e. leading to a possible non-statutory subject matter or indefinite language. And without proper amendments, the claims are not entered for not being in condition, especially when the present rejection still stand and that potential 112, 101 rejections as mentioned above can be of issues.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY